



LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, ----- ^{Division} P
No. Shelf, Section ----- 1
No. Book, -----

* From the Rev. W. B. SPRAGUE, D.D. Sept. 1839.



Sprague Collection. Vol. 454



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

AN
ESSAY
ON
THE ATONEMENT,

BEING
AN ATTEMPT TO ANSWER THE QUESTION,

DID CHRIST DIE FOR ALL MANKIND?

— * —
BY A FRIEND TO TRUTH.
— * —

“ Come, for all things are now ready.”—
THE SAVIOUR.



NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY SAMUEL WHITING & CO.

J. SEYMOUR. PRINT.

— * —
1811.



PREFACE.

ALTHOUGH writings of a controversial nature sometimes disturb the peace of the Church of Christ, by exciting an undesirable opposition, and disaffection among its members; yet there are times in which the state of the Church does absolutely require them. And at such times, if written in a Christian spirit, and with a steady eye to Gospel truth, they may be eminently useful. Whether this Essay be thus seasonable, the public must judge. We have, however, to observe, that as it was not originally designed for the press, the author would not have consented to its publication, had he not believed, that the sentiments which it opposes are, in their consequences, at least, calculated to do much injury to the souls of men.

Such views are entertained by some, of the natural *depravity* of man, and of the *extent* of Christ's atonement, as not only give the sinner an excuse for continuing, *at present*, in a state of impenitence and unbelief; but which, if true, would, we apprehend, even at the *day of judgment*, take away all possibility of the sinner's blaming himself for not being saved through

faith in Christ. We believe that the natural depravity of man is *total*; but, in our view, this depravity is wholly of a *moral* kind, and produces only a *moral* inability; and consequently, every man who hears the Gospel, however depraved in heart, is under obligation immediately to obey it, and has great reason to thank God, for the grace which is offered him, although his heart may never be renewed. We cannot therefore believe, with Dr. Owen, that it is calculated only to *delude* sinners, for God to offer them eternal life, if they will repent and believe, when he has not determined to dispose their hearts to comply with these terms. Nor do we think, that such an offer is, (as the same writer observes,) similar to a person's offering money to a blind man to relieve his necessities, upon the condition, that he will open his eyes. And how the admirers of Dr. Owen can reconcile such a sentiment with the acknowledged truth, that God does, in his word, make such offers to those who will never inherit the kingdom of heaven, we know not.

The doctrine, that Christ died only for a part of mankind, has been represented, as so connected with that of God's distinguishing grace in election, that the Arminian is permitted to triumph, as though he had overthrown the latter, merely by proving from the Scriptures, that Christ died for all mankind, and that the offers of salvation are made to all indiscriminately. Whereas, we conceive, that the Scriptural doctrine of

election is not an election of some, that Christ might die for them in particular, while, in making atonement, others are passed by; but an election, "unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ," out of all mankind, for whom, in the view of him who inhabiteth eternity, atonement has been made, and who have "all, with one consent, gone their way," and refused the invitation to the Gospel feast. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning :" But in the manifestation of his purposes, mankind are considered as having sinned, before he gave his Son to die for them: an atonement as made, and the offers of mercy rejected, before any are "chosen to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

The nature of the atonement has been so explained, as, on the one hand, to give the Socinian too much reason to charge those who believe in the necessity of an atonement, with representing God as unmerciful and implacable; and, on the other, of giving support to the unscriptural and soul-deceiving doctrine of universal salvation. "The whole strength of this objection," says Dr. Edwards, "in which the *Socinians* have so much triumphed, that complete atonement is inconsistent with grace in the pardon of the sinner, depends on the supposition, that the atonement of Christ consists in the *literal payment of a debt*, which we owed to God; and this groundless supposition being set aside, the objection itself

appears equally groundless, and vanishes like dew before the sun." To this we add, that the doctrine of universal salvation rests upon no other foundation than this view of the nature of the atonement.

Should this Essay, under the blessing of God, have the least influence in correcting the errors which have been mentioned, the author will think that his labour has not been in vain.

AN ESSAY,

&c.

“Did Christ die for all mankind?”

BEFORE we proceed to take into consideration the extent of the atonement* of Christ, which is

* The word Atonement is but once used in the English translation of the New Testament, (Rom. v. 11.) And even here it appears to be improperly translated: for the corresponding Greek word is not *ἀλατμος*, which occurs, 1 John ii. 2. and iv. 10. and is translated by the word *propitiation*, and which properly means an *atonement for sin*, but *καταλλαγη*, which means *reconciliation*, as it is translated in the margin, and which, we believe, never signifies an *atonement for sin*. The Greek Lexicons give no other meaning to the word, than **RECONCILIATION**. The translators have invariably, except in the place under consideration, translated it thus. The apostle, in this and the preceding verse, undoubtedly speaks of a reconciliation of *heart* to God. His words are these: “For if when we were enemies we were reconciled [made friends] to God, by the death of his son, [as the ground of reconciliation;] much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received [την καταλλαγην] the reconciliation. What reconciliation? Undoubtedly the reconciliation of heart mentioned in the preceding verse; for nothing else could produce that *joy in God* of which the apostle speaks.

If the remarks which we have made upon this passage of holy writ be correct, it will appear, that it does not, (as some have supposed,) give any support to the doctrine of those, who teach us that *all* for whom Christ made an atonement, will certainly be reconciled to God and saved. Since this passage of Scripture can give not the least support to their doctrine, unless the verb *καταλατω*, from which the words translated *reconciled*, in the tenth verse, are formed, mean *to make an atonement for sin*; which signification, it appears, it never has.

more particularly the subject of our present inquiry, we will endeavour briefly to show its *nature* and *design*.

I. Our great Creator having made man, gave him a law which was holy, just, and good, for the regulation of his conduct; according to which, glory and honour, life and immortality, were the designed rewards of perfect obedience; but tribulation and wrath, pain and death, the appointed recompence to those who should violate it. This law was not rashly given. It required no more than what is due, agreeably to the eternal fitness of things from dependant creatures to their Creator. The penalty annexed to it was not greater than the violators of the law justly deserve. And better would it be to have no world, than to have one destitute of law and government. But all mankind, without exception, having transgressed this law, the voice of justice, the honour of God, and the good of his kingdom forbid, that the violation of it should be disregarded. Better not to have given the law, than after it is given, not to enforce it. And better, ten thousand times better, that all of Adam's race should be eternally miserable, than the character of God be dishonoured. Here then we see the ruined state of fallen man. The law of God must be "magnified and made honourable." But this cannot be done by the violators of it, unless they remain for ever under its condemnation, suffering its penalty. So far are they from being able to atone for the transgression of this holy law, that being alienated from the life of God, and dead in trespasses and sins, they only add iniquity to iniquity, and thus continually make themselves

less worthy of the favour of God, and more deserving of punishment. It being therefore impossible, that by the deeds of the law, any of the human race should be justified in his sight, the all-wise God, willing to magnify the riches of his grace in the salvation of fallen men, and to make known more fully his glorious attributes to his moral kingdom, devised the wonderful plan of salvation by a Redeemer. Agreeably to this plan, the eternal Son of God, the second Person in the adorable Trinity, voluntarily took upon him our nature, and in our stead fully satisfied **PUBLIC JUSTICE***, by suffering what was, as to the purposes of God's government, fully equivalent to the penalty of the law, which we had violated. "On him God laid the iniquities of us all." "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities." "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings." Although we conceive that the dignity of Christ's character rendered it unnecessary, that he should suffer the same quantity of evil as that which was due to the violators of the law, and although his sufferings were in some respects different in kind from those of the damned, since he did not endure the gnawings of a guilty conscience, the horrors of despair, nor the torments necessarily attendant upon a mind filled with enmity to God, yet they answered the same end in the divine government: as great an evidence

* See Dr. Edwards upon the Atonement; to which also we would refer the reader, for a more particular account of the nature of the Atonement.

is given to all intelligent creatures of the evil nature and demerit of sin, of God's abhorrence of it, and fixed determination to punish it, as could be given by the eternal punishment of all the human race. And also, by our Saviour's voluntarily suffering in our stead, the law is publicly acknowledged, even by the Son of God, as "holy, just, and good." The spirit of it is fulfilled, and the forgiveness of those for whom Christ died, upon such terms as infinite wisdom has judged expedient, is made consistent with the preservation of the character and government of God, and consequently with the good of the universe. But it is asked, **How were our iniquities laid on Christ? How could he bear *our* sins?** It is said by some, that they were *transferred* to him. But the Scriptures inform us, that Christ suffered as a lamb, "without blemish and without spot;" that he suffered the *just* for the *unjust*, and that he was God's beloved Son, in whom he was ever well pleased. We may therefore be certain, that guilt was never attached to his character, in the sight of God. Neither is it true, that those for whom Christ died are *without* sin. Repentance, and prayer to God for forgiveness, is the daily employment even of those whose hearts have been renewed by the Holy Spirit. Nor is this unsuitable; for the Scriptures teach us, that "if we say we have *no sin*, we *deserve* ourselves, and the truth is not in us." But a transfer, which leaves the thing transferred *with* the original possessor, and him to whom it is transferred *without* it, is to us wholly unintelligible. Besides, as guilt is ever personal, it appears to us impossible, that it should be transferred. We can as easily conceive,

that the actions themselves should be transferred, as the guilt of them. 'The question therefore recurs, How did Christ bear our sins? 'The apostle Peter answers it. 1 Pet. ii. 24. "Who his own self bare our sins, *in his own body, on the tree*," or cross. Christ bare our sins, by bearing the *sufferings* due to us for them. Although our sins were not transferred to him, yet we are abundantly taught in the Scriptures, that his sufferings were *vicarious*; that he died as a substitute for sinners of Adam's race, and for them only. He is said to die *for the ungodly—for all—to suffer the just for the unjust—to be wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities—to redeem us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us—to be made sin for us*, and the like. But notwithstanding this, those in whose stead Christ died, are personally as sinful, as guilty, and as hell-deserving, as if he had not died for them. Nor have they, *in justice*, the least claim on account of the atonement, considered abstractly from God's covenant faithfulness, either to the favour of God, or to deliverance from deserved punishment. Christ did not satisfy *distributive* or *personal*, but *public* justice: that is, his atonement, merely, hath not brought the Almighty under *obligation* to save those for whom he died, but hath made it consistent with the divine glory for him to *pardon* them, upon such terms as he pleases. In proof of this, we offer the following reasons:

1. Daily experience doth prove, that it is not in fact true, that Christ hath so satisfied for the sins of those for whom he died, that God cannot justly punish them for the same sins. How else shall we

account for the chastisements, the innumerable pains, the dying groans even of the children of God? Are not these some of the wages of iniquity? Do the spotless angels who surround the throne of God, undergo such sufferings? It may be said, that these are only the merciful chastisements of our heavenly Father, for the good of his children. Be it so. But does a kind parent chastise his children for no fault? For our part, we can see no way of accounting for the acknowledged fact, that those for whom Christ died, do suffer sickness, bereavements, pain, and death, unless it be *just* for them to suffer for the *same* sins for which Christ died.

2. If justice can have no claim upon those for whom Christ died, and if he has so purchased for them deliverance from the curse of the law, sanctification, and the happiness of heaven, that these things are *injustice* due to them, are they not very much *injured* by being kept so long out of the purchased inheritance; especially considering the evils to which they are subjected in this world? Should it be said, that Christ, in the covenant with his Father, may have agreed, that those for whom he died, should be, for a time, deprived of the inheritance; we answer: If it be granted that this covenant will admit of *conditions*; if those for whom Christ died may, without injustice, be deprived of the blessings, which he hath purchased for a *time*; who knows, that the conditions of this covenant are not such, that some of those for whom he died may be deprived of these blessings *for ever*? The truth is, by granting that they may, without injustice, be deprived of them just as long as infinite wisdom sees fit, we grant that these blessings are not, in

justice due to them. For that which justice demands, cannot be thus withheld.

3. If it be unjust, that those for whom Christ died, should be punished for their sins, were they not when he died freed from the curse of the law ; i. e. justified, *before they believed*, or even should they never believe ? And is not this directly contrary to the testimony of Scripture ? The Scriptures inform us, that we are justified by *faith*. But how can this be, if we are justified before we have faith ? The Scriptures also inform us, that Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that *believeth* ; that he that believeth not is condemned already ; that the wrath of God abideth on him, &c.

4. As it is believed, by those who advocate the doctrine which we oppose, that Christ has paid the debt of obedience, as well as the debt of punishment ; if, therefore, it be unjust, that those for whom he died should suffer personally for their sins, because this would be exacting the debt twice, would it not, for the *same reason*, be equally unjust, that *personal obedience* should be required of them ?

“ According to this doctrine,” says Dr. Smalley, “ all obligation is now on God’s part, and all grace on theirs. The Almighty is holden, and justly stands bound to them ; they are free from all obligation to him ! All the debts of those for whom Christ died, whether of duty or suffering, are for ever cancelled ! Christ hath done all their duty for them, as well as taken away all possible criminality from them ! If they now love or serve God, it is of mere *gratuity* ; they are not at all obliged [in justice] to do so ! If he bestow upon them all the good in his power, to all eternity, it is of debt, absolute debt, in the high-

est sense of the word ! He can do no more for them, than by a merit of *condignity*, hath been purchased for them, and is of absolute right due to them." But, reader, stop ! Is this the Gospel of the grace of God ?

5. If justice has no claim upon those for whom Christ died, where is the propriety of their praying for pardon of sin, or deliverance from the evils of this life, or of that whieh is to come, due to them for sin ? To pray, is to ask a *favour*. It is unreasonable that we should be obliged to pray for that which is our just due. But if justice will not admit, that those for whom Christ died should be punished for their sins, it is no favour not to punish them ; and do they not therefore act an inconsistent part, in praying either for the pardon of sin, or for deliverance from punishment ? Yea, do not such prayers too plainly intimate, that possibly the judge of all the earth may *not do right* ?

6. If the doctrine which we oppose be true, Christ's *intercession* appears to be improper and useless. We trust it will not be denied, that the intercession of Christ is an act distinct from his atonement, and subsequent to it. If then the atonement of Christ alone places those for whom he died in such a situation, that justice has no claim upon them, why should he, because they *sin*, "ever live to make intercession for them," when there is nothing against them ?

7. The sentimeat whieh we oppose, appears to us to be contrary to the Scriptural doctrine of salvation by grace. St. Paul teaches us, that we are *justified freely by the grace of God* ; that we have *forgiveness*, according to the riches of his grace, &c.

But what grace can there be in justifying those, whom justice itself cannot condemn? Grace is favour shown to the ill-deserving. If, therefore, the obedience and sufferings of Christ were *transferred* to those for whom he died, or *so imputed* to them, that God cannot be *just* if he do not justify and save them, is it not evident, whatever grace there may be in God's giving his Son to die for them, that their *justification* is not an act of *free grace*, but of *debt*? But we have not been able to find any passages of Scripture which assert, that God is under obligation, merely on account of the atonement, to justify and save those for whom Christ died, or that they all will be saved. When God maketh one to differ from another, by granting to him *repentance* and *remission of sins*, and by bringing him to the knowledge of the truth, it is never given as a reason for this difference, that Christ died for the one, and not for the other; but the reason which our Saviour gives is this: "Even so, Father, *for so it seemed good in thy sight.*" Notwithstanding the atonement of Christ, God still claims the right of **HAVING MERCY UPON WHOM HE WILL HAVE MERCY.** We find, indeed, that those who are saved, are justified wholly on account of the merits of Christ; that they are "*reconciled to God by the death of his Son,*" (Rom. v. 10.) and that if God please to justify his elect on account of the death of Christ, no one has any right to condemn them, or to lay any thing to their charge, (Rom. viii. 33, 34.) And we also find, that all whom the Father hath given to the Son, as the reward of his obedience unto death, "*shall come unto him,*" and that "*he that cometh, he will in no wise cast out.*"

Nor should we hesitate to acknowledge, that the Father may be, by *promise*, under obligation to the Son, for the salvation of all who are thus given to him, that is, for the salvation of all the elect; and that in due time, agreeably to this promise, faith and repentence shall be given to them, and they be made meet for an inheritance among the saints. But let it be observed, that this obligation is founded upon the promise of God, to his Son, and that he is under no obligation whatever to the *sinner*, (either by promise, or any other way,) to save him, as long as he continues impenitent and unbelieving. And we trust also that it will be made to appear, in the course of this Essay, that Christ died for some who are not of the elect, and consequently for some who will never be “reconciled to God, by the death of his Son.”

In short, the *nature* and *design* of the atonement cannot be better expressed, than in the words of St. Paul, Rom. iii. 25. “Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, (or an atonement,) through faith in his blood.” For what purpose? “To declare his *righteousness*, for the remission of sins that are passed, through the forbearance of God. To declare, I say, at this time, his *righteousness*, that he **MIGHT BE JUST**, and yet the **JUSTIFIER** of him that **BELIEVETH IN JESUS.**” This was all that was necessary to be done. There was need only, that a way should be provided for the honourable exercise of grace, and the boundless goodness of God would prompt him to save to the uttermost, as far as infinite wisdom should judge best, or the good of the universe admit.

II. Having thus briefly explained the nature and design of the atonement, we will now inquire, whether this atonement was made for *all mankind*? The question is not whether God has determined to *save* all mankind. The purpose of God with respect to the number that shall be saved, is a thing entirely distinct. Neither do we ask, whether God does as much, in every respect, for the salvation of one man, as he does for the salvation of another. We are certain that he does not. But our inquiry is, *Whether the atonement be sufficient for the justification and actual redemption of all mankind, without exception, if they would comply with the Gospel terms of salvation?* *Geo.* —

That the atonement has been thus made for *all mankind*, we think is evident,

From the command of our Saviour, that the Gospel should be preached to all mankind :

From the invitations, exhortations, and even commands, addressed to all who hear the Gospel, to repent of their sins, to believe in Christ, and to put their trust in him for salvation, whether they are elected or not :

From the reason assigned by St. Paul to enforce the duty of praying for all mankind, living upon the earth ; for the non-elect, as well as the elect : and

From numerous passages of Scripture, which, as we conceive, expressly declare it.

1. Our Saviour has commanded his ministers to preach the Gospel to all mankind, without exception.

The argument will have its full weight, if it can be shown, that our Saviour commanded his ministers to preach the Gospel to those who were *not*

elected. But who will deny that he commanded them to do this? The Gospel, agreeably to our Saviour's direction, was first preached to the Jews in general. But did not a large majority of those, to whom, as Paul and Barnabas declared, it was *necessary* that the word of God should be first preached, "put it from them, and judge themselves unworthy of eternal life," and yet were the apostles directed to preach the Gospel to none but the elect? Did not our Saviour also command his apostles to "go and teach all nations?" And, in short, did he not command them to "go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature?" And is not the same command addressed to his ministers in every age? But what is the Gospel? *Good news* is the import of the term. Good news is therefore to be preached in *all the world, to every creature*. Accordingly, when the angel of the Lord announced to the shepherds the birth of our Saviour, he says; "Behold, I bring you *good tidings of great joy*, which shall be to **ALL PEOPLE**." Yes, to all without exception, wherever the sound of the Gospel shall come. "And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, *good will* towards men:" men in general. For men do not diminish the grace of God, by rejecting it and trampling it under their feet. Had God in his eternal purpose not "chosen one soul to salvation through sanctification of the spirit, and belief of the truth," and consequently permitted all men to reject his offered mercy, and to perish in their sins, the heavenly host might have sung the same song. But if the particular

number of the elect and non-elect be determined, previously to the belief of the former, (which is certainly the case;) and if Christ by his atonement made no provision *whatever* for the salvation of the *non-elect*; how his birth could be considered by the angel as good news of great joy to them, or how the apostles could consistently, on account of the atonement, or indeed on any other account, preach good news to them, appears to us utterly inconceivable.

2. All men, who hear the Gospel, the non-elect as well as the elect, are invited, exhorted, and even commanded, to repent of their sins, to believe in Christ, and to put their trust in him for salvation.

The truth of this proposition cannot be denied. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways, for why will ye die, O house of Israel!" "The Lord is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." "But God now commandeth all men, every where, to repent." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." "And this is his commandment, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ." "The Spirit and the bride say, Come, and let him that heareth, say, Come,—and *whosoever will*, let him take of the water of life freely." It would be easy to quote many more passages of Scripture of a similar import, if these were not abundantly sufficient to establish the truth of the proposition.

We would now seriously inquire, whether these

things are so ; whether it be true, that God does command *all men, every where*, (who hear the Gospel,) to repent, *not willing that any should perish*, but that all should obey the command, come to repentance, and consequently be saved. And if this be true, we would next inquire, whether God is willing that they should be saved, through faith in Jesus Christ, or by some other name. If it be granted, that there is no other name given under heaven, among men, by which any can be saved, but the name of Jesus, we would wish to know, how God can be said to be willing, that those for whom Christ has not died, should be saved through faith in him* !

Again, Does not the Gospel require every man not only to believe in Christ, but also to believe, that

* As some suppose, that it is calculated only to mock and delude sinners, to command them to repent and believe, and to tell them that God is *willing that they should be saved*, if they will comply with the terms of the Gospel, when they are unable to do it, we would observe,

1. That it is in fact true, that God does command all who hear the Gospel, the non-elect as well as the elect, to repent and believe, and unless he is unwilling, that they should *obey his command*, he is willing that they should be saved ; for salvation is promised to the penitent and believing. Besides, it is expressly declared, (1 Tim. ii. 4. & 2 Pet. iii. 9.) that God is willing that all men should be saved. So that whether it be calculated only to delude sinners or not, to tell them, without distinction, that God is willing they should all be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth; we have the example of the word of God to warrant us to do it.

2. Sinners are under no inability to comply with the terms of the Gospel, but that which is wholly of a *moral* kind. Nothing but a wicked heart, a perverse and obstinate will, hinders them from complying. They will not come unto Christ, that they may have life. Their inability is therefore their *sin*, and not their excuse, and is perfectly consistent with their being commanded to repent and believe, with *sincere* promises of eternal life, if they will obey.

ke in particular, may be saved, if he will comply with the requisition, that is, if he will believe? Is not a promise of salvation generally connected with the command to believe? And are we not under obligation to believe that God will fulfil the promises which he himself has made? The language of the Gospel to every unbeliever is, " Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and *thou* shalt be saved." Are not then the non-elect, provided no atonement has been made for them, required to believe that which is **NOT TRUE**? And should a minister of the Gospel address one for whom Christ did not die, in the same words as Paul and Barnabas did the jailor, would he speak the **TRUTH**? Does not every one see, that if no atonement has been made for the non-elect, their salvation is utterly impossible upon any condition or supposition whatever? If this be not the case, an atonement was unnecessary: for if the non-elect can be saved without it, the elect might have been; and will not then the infinitely wise God stand chargeable with inconsistency, in giving his Son to die for us, when we might have been saved without it? Indeed it appears highly improper, that any for whom Christ has not died, should be commanded, to believe in him, or to put their trust in him for salvation, since they cannot comply with the command, without believing that Christ died for them, unless they dishonour the character of Jehovah, by believing that Christ's death was *unnecessary*. That the inconsistencies of the scheme which we oppose may be made, if possible, still more plain, let us for a moment imagine, that a minister of the Gospel should address his hearers in such language as the following:—

“ God, our Creator, beholding the ruined and deplorable state into which the whole human race were plunged by sin, so loved this rebellious world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him *might be saved*. I exhort and entreat you all, therefore, to be sensible, that you are in so sinful, perishing, and helpless a state, as to need just such a Saviour, and to manifest your sense of this, by repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. For there is no other possible way of deliverance, no other name given under heaven among men, by which any can be saved. But by a compliance with these terms*, *every one* of you may have eternal life. This good news of eternal salvation through faith in Christ, all his ministers are sent forth to preach to every human creature, of every nation, and of every language. Whosoever will, therefore, let him take of the water of life freely, for there is no respect of persons with God. But I must also inform you, that God did not send his Son into the world, that *all* of the world through him *might be saved*. The salvation of a large proportion of the human race is not now,

* When we speak of faith or repentance as a term or condition of salvation, we would, by no means, be understood to intend a meritorious condition; as this would be directly contrary to the very nature of faith and repentance: for these graces imply an absolute renunciation of all merit in the subject of them, and an entire dependence upon the merits of Christ for salvation. But God hath required all men to repent and believe, and without a compliance with this requisition, no person can be saved: for it is altogether unsuitable, that God should bestow eternal life upon a person of an opposite character.

nor has it ever been, since the fall of man, in any sense, *possible*. For since Christ hath made no atonement for them, their salvation is as impossible as if he had never died. Yea, it is more than probable, that a large number of you who now hear me, (who, as I have just observed, may every one be saved, if you will believe,) and possibly all of you, belong to that number for whose salvation no provision has been made. But this alters not the case. It is as much the duty of those, for whom Christ did not die, to believe that they may be saved if they will comply with the terms of the Gospel, as it is of those for whom he did die ; and they have as much encouragement, and are under as great obligation to put their trust in Christ for salvation, as if he actually had died for them ! Yea, they are commanded to do it, under pain of eternal damnation !” We are sensible that the inconsistency of the foregoing language is so manifest, that no minister of the Gospel could seriously deliver it as his own sentiment ; and yet it appears to us to be no more inconsistent than that system which teaches us, that the invitations, promises, and commands of the Gospel, are addressed to *all mankind*, whilst the atonement is made only for the *elect*.

But here it is said, As the minister does not know that any of his hearers are of that number for whom Christ did not die, it is proper for him to invite and exhort them all, in the same manner as he would, if he knew that provision was made for the salvation of them all ; for since none but those for whom Christ died, will comply with the terms of salvation, no disappointment will be occasioned.

To this we answer. Neither does the minister

know, (if the atonement be limited,) that Christ has died for any of his hearers. If his ignorance, therefore, will warrant him to address the whole of his audience, as if Christ had died for them *all*, why may it not also warrant him to address them, as if Christ had died for *none* of them; and to tell them plainly, that as no provision has been made for their salvation, he has no *good news*, i. e. no *Gospel*, for them! But we apprehend it can make no difference, whether the minister knows those for whom Christ died or not. The message which he delivers is not his own, but his Lord's, who does know. And the propriety of a message from heaven, does not depend upon the ignorance of the messenger, since this can make no difference, either in the message, or in the state of those to whom it is delivered. And we presume it will be readily acknowledged, that if a minister of the Gospel did know any for whom Christ had made no atonement, it would be improper, if not dishonest, to mock them with the offers of mercy. And shall we attribute that to the Master, which would be dishonourable in the servant? God forbid!

Neither can we conceive, that the unwillingness of the non-elect to accept of the offers of mercy, can make the offers sincere, when if they would accept, they must be disappointed.

Should a man send out his servant to invite his neighbours to come and dine with him, to tell them that "his oxen and fatlings are killed, and that all things are ready," and to urge and entreat them to come immediately, when at the same time he had made provision only for his own family, and a few particular friends, without having prepared, or hav-

ing even intended to prepare any thing for those whom he so earnestly invites; would he be clear from the charge of *insincerity*, because he actually knew, that his neighbours hated him so, that not one of them would come? And if his neighbours should ever discover the truth, would they consider his pressing invitation as an expression of love and good-will, or as an insult?

3. Our third argument to prove that the atonement was made for all mankind, or for the non-elect as well as the elect, is founded upon the reason assigned by St. Paul to enforce the duty of praying for all men living upon the earth, the non-elect being included as well as the elect.

The direction of St. Paul to Timothy to pray for all men, is in these words:—" I exhort, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men, for kings, and for all in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty." That there were living upon the earth those who were not elected to eternal life, at the time when the Holy Ghost inspired St. Paul to give this direction to Timothy, will not be denied. And if there were any such, Timothy was exhorted to pray for them; for he was exhorted to pray for *all men*, even for *kings*, and *all in authority*; although the rulers of the earth were then generally heathens, and continued so until their death; and although St. Paul himself taught his brethren, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many *mighty*, not many *noble*," were called, but that "God had chosen the *weak* things of the world to confound the things which were *mighty*." It being, therefore,

evident, that Timothy was exhorted to pray for those who were not elected, as well as for those who were, we will now consider the reason which the apostle gives to enforce this duty. “ For this is good and acceptable, in the sight of God our Saviour, who *is willing that all men should be saved**, and come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus who gave himself [*αντιλυτόν*] a price of redemption for all,” or, (which is the same thing,) *made an atonement for all*. These words of the apostle appear to us incontrovertibly to establish the truth of the doctrine, that *Christ died for all mankind*, unless it can be shown, that all those for whom Timothy was exhorted to pray were, at least, probably elected to eternal life: which is a task, it is presumed, no one will undertake. For it will not be denied, that the word **ALL**, when it expresses the number of those that God our Saviour is willing should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, and for whom he gave himself a price of redemption, must include as many, as when it expresses the number of those for whom Timothy was exhorted to pray. Every one will immediately see, that if it does not, there will be no consistency in the apostle’s reasoning. What propriety would there be in exhorting Timothy to pray for *all* men, for kings, and for *all* in authority, because our Saviour was willing that *some* men, and some in authority *only*, should be saved, and had manifested

* This is the literal translation of the Greek *πάντας αὐθεωπούς θέλει σωθῆναι*, which has no reference to the decretive will, or purpose of God, but, (as the best Commentators observe,) is of the same import as 2 Pet. iii. 9.

this willingness by giving himself a ransom for them? Indeed there would be, (as Dr. Scott, in his notes on this passage, well observes,) as much propriety in saying, “*God willeth or purposeth that all men should be damned*, as there is in saying, as many do, that the apostle means, that *God willeth that some of all sorts should be saved*: for, doubtless, some of all nations, ranks, and orders, will be left to perish in their sins, whereunto also they were appointed.”

There may be a difference of opinion with respect to the nature or design of the prayers which Timothy was exhorted to offer up. With this we have nothing to do, as it does not concern the present argument. The only use which we make of the exhortation is, to determine whether Timothy was exhorted to pray for any of the *non-elect*, and consequently, whether Christ gave himself a *price of redemption for them*. But here it may be said, that Timothy was not exhorted to pray for *all* mankind, since many were dead before the exhortation was given, and others, perhaps, had committed the unpardonable sin, which, according to St. John, would also render them improper subjects of prayer; and that this argument cannot therefore prove, that Christ gave himself a ransom for all the human race. To this it may be replied, As it is granted by all, that this exhortation is to be considered as addressed not only to Timothy, but also to all Christ’s ministers, in every age, since it was first given, we may, I think, infer from the attributes of God, particularly his immutability, that it was also agreeable to his will, before the days of Timothy, that “*prayers and intercessions*”

should be made for all men living on the earth, who had not committed the unpardonable sin*. And if this inference be just, it will follow unavoidably, that every individual of Adam's race either is, has been, or will be, a proper subject of prayer ; since even the blasphemer against the Holy Ghost might have been prayed for, agreeably to the will of God, before he committed the unpardonable sin. But even if this were not so ; if it had never been the will of God, that "prayers and intercessions should be made for ALL men, for kings, and for all in authority," either before this exhortation was given to Timothy, or since his death ; yet it would not in the least invalidate the present argument. For it will not be denied, that *some* of those for whom Timothy was exhorted to pray, and for whom Christ gave himself a price of redemption, were never brought to "the knowledge of the truth ;" and consequently were not elected to eternal life. And if it be acknowledged that Christ made an atonement for *some* of the non-elect, the partition wall is broken down, and the universality of the atonement must be admitted.

We apprehend, the principal reason why any have thought that the word ALL, in this chapter, should be confined to the elect, is because they supposed, that if it included all the human race, it would lead to the soul-destroying doctrine of universal salvation. But if God had done nothing more than make provision, by a full atonement, for

* It may be observed, that the very exception, which is made by St. John, of the sin which is unto death, proves, that all who have not committed this sin, are the proper subjects of prayer ; otherwise those who have committed it, are not distinguished from the rest of the non-elect.

the salvation of all men through faith in Christ, and manifest his willingness that all men should be saved in this way, and come to the knowledge of the truth, without determining, by the renovating influences of the Holy Ghost, to make them willing, (and no such determination is here implied,) any one, who is sensible of the *total* depravity of the human heart, will easily be persuaded, that the salvation of *all* men would be so far from being certain, that not *one* of them would be saved. It is not enough that men be placed in such a situation, that they may be saved, if they are not prevented by their own fault. To secure their destruction, they need only be left of God to go their own way; but to secure their salvation, the work must be taken out of their own hands*.

4. The Scriptures do, in our opinion, unequivocally and expressly teach us, that Christ died, or made an atonement, for all mankind.

A few of the numerous passages which teach this important doctrine will be noticed. John i. 29. "Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away," or beareth, (as it is in the margin,) "the sin of the

* "If it be objected," say the continuators of Mr. Pool, "how is it consistent with Christ's giving himself a ransom for all, that so many perish in their sins? The answer is clear, we must distinguish between the *sufficiency* of his ransom, and the *efficacy* of it: he paid a ransom worthy to obtain the *salvation of all men*, and has done whatever was requisite to reconcile God, and make men capable of salvation; but only those, who by a lively faith depend upon him and obey him, are actual partakers of salvation: that is, there is *no person* but may be saved in believing; and if men perish, it is not from a defect of righteousness in the Mediator, but from the *love of their lusts, and their obstinately rejecting their own mercies*: and it is *unjust*, that the glory of his divine compassion and love should be *obscured or lessened* for their ungrateful neglect of it."

world." It is worthy of observation, that the word *sin*, is in the singular number, meaning the collected sin of all the human race. So true it is, that " God laid on him the iniquities of us all."

Again, John iii. 16, 17, 18. " God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth in him is not condemned, but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God." It was hardly possible for our Saviour to express the fulness of his atonement, in plainer, or in less confined terms, than he has here expressed it. It appears never to have entered into his mind, that any would perish, under the light of the Gospel, except for *unbelief*. He mentions no other cause of their destruction, but expressly assures us, that God sent his Son into the world, that the *world* through him *might be saved*. But is it not plain, if there be any part for whom Christ has made no atonement, that *belief* or *unbelief* can make no difference with them? Must not their salvation be utterly impossible, upon any condition or supposition whatever?

If it be said, our Saviour is here speaking of the *elect world*,—We ask, How is this known? Christ himself has not given us any intimation of it. And surely it will not be pretended, that this is an ordinary meaning of the word *world*. This word is frequently used in the New Testament, especially by St. John; but we apprehend it will be found generally, if not *always*, that whenever he, or any

other inspired writer, uses it in a limited sense, he means either a portion of the world including people of all characters, or, (which is more common,) either the whole, or part of the *unbelieving* world, as distinguished from the Church, or professed followers of Christ. We need only supply the word *elect*, where it is thought to be understood, and we shall have convincing evidence, that our Saviour did not mean to have it understood, “God so loved the *elect* world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever of the *elect* world believeth in him, should not *perish*, but have everlasting life: for God sent not his Son into the *elect* world, to condemn the *elect* world, but that the *elect* world through him *might be saved*.” That is, there is a possibility of it, but no certainty! Was Christ sent into the *elect* world only? Is the salvation of the *elect* merely possible? And above all, is it true of the *elect*, and of them only, that whosoever believeth on the Son shall not perish, but have everlasting life; and consequently, that whosoever believeth not, shall *perish*? Is it not plain, that those who *perish through unbelief*, and who are “condemned already,” belong to the same world, which God loved, and for which he gave his only begotten Son, that it *might be saved*? Yea, is there not as much evidence of this, as there is, that those who have *everlasting life* belong to it? But will perdition be the lot of any of God’s *elect*? No. As long as the throne of God endures; as long as Christ is able to save them from Satan’s grasp, so long is their salvation *certain*.

The passage of Scripture which we will next notice, is recorded in Heb. ii. 9. “But we see Jesus,

who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should *taste death for every man.*” Although this text appears to us too plain to need any comment ; yet, since it is thought by some, that the 40th verse limits these words to the elect, because none but them will be brought to glory ; that the reader may see the exact conformity of this passage of Scripture to the sentiments contained in this Essay, we would observe, that though Christ “ tasted death for *every man,*” and is thus made “ perfect through sufferings,” it is not our opinion, that God in his eternal counsel, ever purposed to save, or “ bring to glory,” any but the elect.

The two following passages of Scripture teach us, that Christ did die for some who, notwithstanding, may actually perish. 1 Cor. viii. 11. “ And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother, (brother by profession,) *perish,* for whom Christ died.” 2 Pet. ii. 1. “ But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that BOUGHT THEM, and bring upon themselves *swift destruction.*” “ That there is a sense,” says Dr. Witherspoon, in his sermon on 1 John ii. 2. “ in which Christ died for all men, and even for those who *perish,* is plain from the very words of Scripture ; 1 Tim. iv. 10. and 1 Cor. viii. 11. Thus it appears, that both in a national and *personal* view, Christ is the propitiation for our sins ; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *WHOLE WORLD.*”

We will notice but one text more, 2 Cor. v. 14.

“ For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead ; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again.”

What is here meant by the phrase, “ then were all dead ? ” Dr. Owen, Mr. Witsius, and some other advocates for a limited atonement tell us, that it means, all were dead *to sin*, and then infer, that the word *all* cannot include any more than the elect. To this we answer, neither can it include all the elect. The verb “ were dead ” is in the past tense, and if it mean “ were dead *to sin*,” the word *all* cannot include any of the elect who have been born since the death of Christ, unless we introduce the monstrous supposition, that they were sanctified before they were born ! But even if we could avoid this absurdity, it would be impossible for us to conceive how the elect can be said to be dead *to sin*, merely because Christ has died for them. We have no evidence, that the elect, previously to the regenerating influences of the Holy Ghost, are any more dead *to sin* than the non-elect. Setting aside, therefore, this explanation of the passage, we will adopt the more rational interpretation of those, who suppose that the apostle means, were dead *in sin*. This makes the apostle’s argument natural and intelligible ; “ If one died for all, then were all dead ” *in sin*. That is, all men were in so sinful and helpless a state, that there was no possibility of their delivering themselves, and consequently needed some one to die, (i. e. make an atonement,) for them. But again it is said, the apostle is speaking only of the elect. And again we ask, How is this known ?

The apostle does not say so, nor does he intimate any such thing. And is it true of the elect only ? Are not all men, whether eleeted or not, naturally dead in trespasses and sins ? Besides, the apostle by the expression, “ he died for all, that *they which live,*” &c. plainly intimates, that he did not expect that all for whom Christ died, and who were dead, would live to him who died for them. But if he had intended to include only the *elect*, he would have been *certain*, that all of them would live to Christ. We are therefore led to the conclusion, that the apostle meant to teach us, in this passage, that all were dead in sin, whether eleeted or not, and that Christ died for all mankind—for the non-eleect as well as the eleet. The truth is, the apostle, in this passage, takes it for granted, as a fact not disputed, that Christ died for *all*, and hence infers, that all were *dead in sin*—in a perishing, helpless state ; and then draws the conclusion, that those who are delivered from this state, and made spiritually alive, should not live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them. But where is the necessity of torturing the Scriptures merely to avoid the doctrine of a full atonement ? Was not Christ able to bear “ the sin of the world ?” Were not his sufferings sufficient to atone “ for the sins of the whole world ?” Surely this will not be pretended. He was the eternal and only begotten Son of God ; “ the brightness of the Father’s glory, and the express image of his person.” “ Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” Are there any passages of Scripture which tell us that Christ did *not* die for all mankind, and which therefore oblige us to limit

those which say that he did? We have not been able to find any such passages. Will the doctrine of a full atonement be, as some have apprehended, attended with bad consequences, by contradicting or subverting some of the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel*? This, we conceive, is not true; but, on the contrary, let this doctrine be admitted, and the whole plan of the Gospel will be consistent and harmonious. But does not our Saviour say, "I lay down my life for the sheep?" He certainly does. And least of all would those who believe that

* As some object to the doctrine which we are endeavouring to establish, because it is not exactly conformable to what has been, and is yet maintained by many worthy Calvinistic Divines, that we may not appear to differ from them more than we actually do, it may be proper to observe, that the doctrine of Calvin was, that Christ did not die *efficaciously* to redeem any but the elect; or, as it has been sometimes expressed, "with a distinct purpose and design to *save* all mankind." And if the question should be proposed to us, in this form, we should also say that he did not: for the counsel of God shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure. But we object to uniting the purpose of God, with respect to the number that shall be saved, with the atonement of Christ, and considering both as of the same extent. The Scriptures, we think, plainly teach, that Christ died as a propitiation for the sins of the "whole world." But this does not necessarily imply, that God will save the whole world. In the former part of this Essay, we endeavoured to show, that those for whom Christ died are not, *merely*, on account of his death, less sinful and hell-deserving than they would have been, if Christ had not died; and that they have not, in *justice*, any claim to salvation on account of what Christ has done for them. And the Gospel every where teaches, that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," only to them that *believe*, (Rom. x. 4. ;) that none but believers are delivered from its curse. The satisfaction which Christ has made, has rendered it consistent, that the Gospel terms of salvation should be proposed to "every creature;" and that every one who complies with them should be saved; and also, that God should, by the regenerating influences of the Holy Ghost, make whom he please willing to comply with them.

Christ died for all mankind, wish to exclude his Church or peculiar people. Our Saviour does not say, that he laid down his life for *none* but the sheep. And we are sure that St. John, who recorded these words, did not understand by them that Christ died only for his followers, for he elsewhere expressly says, "he is the propitiation not only for our sins," that is, the sins of his sheep or followers, "but also for the sins of the whole world." If a passage of Scripture could be found, in which it is said, that Christ died for the sheep or for the elect *only*, something would be done towards proving the doctrine of a limited atonement.

If we attend to the connexion in which these words stand, we shall find that our Saviour designed by them to prove that he was "the good shepherd," and not an hireling. We may therefore assign a very good reason why our Saviour did not mention his dying for any who were not his sheep; since it would have been entirely foreign to his subject. And, in this way, we must account for many other expressions in the Scriptures, in which Christ is said to have died for a part of mankind. In Gal. ii. 20. St. Paul says that Christ died for him; and does not say that he died for any other person. In Rom. iv. 25. he tells the Church at Rome, that Christ was delivered for their offences and his own. In Eph. v. 25. that he died for the Church in general. And in Heb. ii. 9. that he "tasted death for *every man*." So also in John x. 15. we are told that Christ laid down his life for the *sheep*; and in 1 John ii. 2. that "he is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*." Is there here any inconsistency? or rather, do not these

passages of Scripture, viewed in connexion, plainly teach us, that the extent of Christ's death is not to be limited to any portion of mankind ; and that the Holy Spirit did not intend by such phrases as, he died for me—for us—for the Church, &c. to express its full extent ? But it is also asked, How can the atonement of Christ render the salvation of all men possible, when all men have not had the means of grace ; and many were dead, and therefore out of the reach of mercy, before his blood was shed ? To this we answer,

1st. Had not Adam's fallen race loved darkness rather than light ; had they not been desperately wicked, and determined to forsake the fountain of living waters, saying unto the Almighty, depart from us, we desire not the knowledge of thy ways ; not one of them, since the creation, would have been destitute of the means of grace. God revealed his own character, and the way of salvation through Christ, to our first parents ; and Noah, who was the father of the new world, was not only a righteous man, but a “preacher of righteousness.” God has also in all ages of the world had a seed to serve him. He has used means for the conversion of those who had forsaken him. And the language of the Holy Ghost, and of the Church to mankind has ever been, “. whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely.” And it is owing wholly to the wickedness of the human heart, which is naturally the same in all, that any have ever been so far off, that they could not hear the sound of the gracious invitation. Nor are the heathen suffering unjustly for the sins of their fathers. They are as wicked in heart, and as oppos-

ed to God as their fathers were, whom God gave over to a reprobate mind, because they did not like to retain him in their knowledge. And this opposition to the truth they have always manifested, whenever exertions have been made for their conversion. Their having been without the means of grace, therefore, does not give the least shadow of evidence, that God was not willing they should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, but proves only that he had not determined to "compel them to come in."

2d. The atonement is full and complete, so that God can, consistently with his perfections, "have mercy upon whom he will have mercy." There is not an individual of Adam's race, upon the face of the earth, whom we believe God cannot, upon the ground of the atonement, make a trophy of his victorious grace, if infinite wisdom judge it to be best. Neither has there ever been such an individual, nor will there ever be. And as for the objection, that many were dead and out of the reach of mercy before Christ died, it is of no force. It is founded upon the supposition, that men could not have the means of grace before Christ's death, which is not true. It is also objected, that if all those for whom Christ died be not saved, Christ's priestly office is torn asunder, since he makes an atonement for some for whom he will not pray: for Christ says, "I pray not for the world."

Although this objection is often urged with much confidence, yet it is difficult for us to conceive in what its force consists. We acknowledge that

Christ's making an atonement, and his interceding for his people, are both parts of his priestly office, yet they appear to us to be distinct parts, and not necessarily one and the same thing. It is easy to conceive, that great and important ends may be answered by God's opening a door of salvation for the non-elect, by the atonement of Christ, so as to leave them wholly without excuse, although he has never purposed to "compel them to come in." And it surely will not be pretended, that because Christ has been so merciful and gracious to the non elect, as to die for them, that, on this very account, he has brought himself under obligation to pray for, and save them; although they wilfully and obstinately reject his proffered mercies. And should any think it inconsistent for Christ to do any thing for the non-elect, in his mediatorial character, without securing their salvation, we would ask, whether it be not true, that the non-elect do receive favours from Christ in this capacity? Is it not on account of his *death*, that they enjoy the means of grace; that the Gospel is to be preached "to every creature," whether elected or not? And are we not, moreover, taught, in Luke xiii. 8. that through the *intercession* of Christ, these means are continued to them longer than they otherwise would be?

We will now conclude with a few inferences from what has been advanced.

1. From the nature of the atonement we learn, that those are in a very great error, who imagine that all men will be saved, merely on account of the fulness of the atonement. But if Christ died for the sins of all mankind, will not all be saved? We answer; No, not one of them, *merely* because

Christ has died. God is not, on account of the atonement alone, exclusive of his promise, under *obligation* to grant to one sinner eternal life, or to deliver him from deserved punishment. The doctrine, that the obedience and sufferings of Christ were transferred to those for whom he died, or so imputed to them, that they can claim deliverance from punishment, and eternal happiness, as their *just* due, is, in our view, unscriptural, and irrational. We know that some excellent Calvinistic Divines have ineptly taught, that this is the nature of the atonement, and we also know, that others, taking advantage of this, have founded upon it the unscriptural doctrine of universal salvation*.

In the former part of this Essay we offered our reasons for rejecting this view of the nature of the atonement. We observed, that it was not, in fact, true, that God cannot consistently punish men for

* It is much to be lamented, that those who "are set for the defence of the Gospel," have given such erroneous views of the *nature* of the atonement, as to afford support to a doctrine so pernicious to the souls of men, as that of universal salvation. Men are taught, even by some of the most worthy ministers of Christ, that all for whom Christ died must be saved. That God cannot be "merciful and *just*," unless he save them. They then open the Scriptures, and find that Christ gave himself a *ransom for all*; that he tasted death for *every man*; and that he is the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*; and the unavoidable conclusion is, that all men will be saved: a conclusion, which directly contradicts not only the plainest declarations of Scripture, but also the whole tenour of the Gospel. Does this contradiction really exist in the word of God, or have ministers mistaken the *nature* of the atonement? Can any hesitate in answering this question? But, on the other hand, let it be shown, that a full atonement is consistent with the final perdition of a part of mankind, and the sandy foundation of the universalist is washed away, the superstructure falls, and ruin to his whole system immediately ensues.

the *same* sins for which Christ died, because he actually does do it, in part, in this life. We also endeavoured to show, that if this were the real nature of the atonement, those for whom Christ died, are treated unjustly, by being kept so long out of their *purchased inheritance*—that they are delivered from the curse of the law, (that is, justified,) *before they believe*—that if Christ has paid the full debt of obedience, as well as the debt of punishment, they are under no obligation, on the ground of justice, to obey—that it is improper for them to *pray* for pardon of sin, or deliverance from the evils of this life, or of that which is to come—that Christ's *intercession* is improper and useless; and that there is no *grace* in their *justification*.

But will not Christ's blood be spilt in vain, at least in part, if all for whom he died are not saved? We answer, No, in no wise. Christ did not die to free men from all obligation to obey their Creator, and to bring the Almighty under obligation to save them, and to do it, even though they are ever so unwilling to come to the knowledge of the truth. According to St. Paul, Christ was set forth to be a propitiation through *faith* in his blood, to declare the *righteousness* of God, so that he might be *just*, and yet the *justifier* of him that *believeth* in Jesus. And this purpose is fully answered, let the number of the saved be what it may. Besides, the sufferings of Christ would have been the *same*, whether he was the propitiation for the sins of the elect only, or “also for the sins of the whole world,” or of ten thousand worlds, if it had been the will of God, that he should die for so many. So that if the objection have any weight, (which we apprehend it

it has not,) it will have the *same* weight, whether the atonement be for *all*, or only for the *elect*, or whether all be saved, or only a part. The law and government of God must be “magnified and made honourable,” before the pardon of one sinner could be consistent; and after this is done, pardon may be extended to Adam’s guilty race, just as far, and upon just such terms, as infinite wisdom sees fit. We may also observe, that Christ “shall see of the travail of his soul, and be *satisfied*.” Every one, whom the Father hath given to him, shall be brought to glory. Yea, every purpose, whether direct or indirect, which God ever designed should be effected by the death of his Son, will be effected. How then, we ask, has he spilt his blood in vain?

But if the atonement of Christ has rendered the salvation of all men, (if they will comply with the terms of the Gospel,) *consistent* with justice, will not the goodness of God incline him to save all, and as he has the hearts of all men in his hands, to make them willing in the day of his power? To this we answer, the goodness of God will incline him to save, and to “prepare for glory,” just as many as he judges to be best, and no more. If, therefore, we would know whether all will be saved or not, we must look into God’s revealed will, and no where else. For since men are unwilling to come to the knowledge of the truth, nothing can be inferred from the fulness of the atonement, with respect to the number that will be saved. If then it be asked, Why will not all mankind be saved? We answer; it is not because Christ has not “died for all,” nor because God our Saviour is not “willing that all men should be saved;” but it is because

they “ love darkness rather than light,” and “ will not come unto Christ, that they may have life.” If again it be asked, Why does not this unwillingness prevent the salvation of all, since it is the same in all? We answer, in the language of St. Paul, (Eph. i. 4, 5.) Because God “ hath chosen some, in Christ, before the foundation of the world, that they *should be holy*, and without blame before him in love: having predestinated them to the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the **GOOD PLEASURE OF HIS WILL**, to the praise of the glory of his grace.” These are given to Christ in the eternal covenant of redemption. And all who are thus “ given to him, shall come unto him, and him that cometh, he will in no wise cast out.” (John vi. 37.) In them Christ “ shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied.” Although they are by nature the children of wrath, even as others, being alienated from the life of God, and dead in trespasses and sins, yet he, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, doth shine into their hearts, to give them the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ. They are delivered from the bondage of sin, “ by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost,” and being thus “ afore prepared unto glory,” they “ are kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation.”

And finally, if it be asked, Why hath not God thus chosen all to salvation? We answer, in the words of our saviour, (Matt xi. 26.) “ **EVEN SO, FATHER, FOR SO IT SEEMED GOOD IN THY SIGHT.**” For although the Scriptures might warrant us

to offer several other reasons, why God has not chosen all to salvation ; yet as this reason appears to be amply sufficient to satisfy every humble inquirer, no other need now be given. For since our Saviour hath expressly told us, that whilst some shall come forth from their graves, “ to the resurrection of life,” others shall come forth “ to the resurrection of damnation,” and “ shall go away into everlasting punishment :” it is the height of folly and impiety for any one to rise up in the face of the judge of quick and dead, and condemn the eternal counsels of heaven as unwise, merely because they are beyond his shallow comprehension ! As well might he

“ Snatch from his hand the balance and the rod,
“ Re-judge his justice, be the god of God !”

2. From the fulness of the atonement we learn, that no sinner, who enjoys the light of the Gospel, has the least excuse for not being saved through faith in Christ, and that he never will have such an excuse.

Although if Christ had made no atonement for the non-elect, they would have been justly condemned for transgressing the law of God, and the enmity of their hearts to God would have been manifested by their opposition to Christ, and his holy religion ; yet when they should discover, that their salvation through faith in Christ was never *possible*, and therefore, that the offers of mercy, with respect to them, could never have been sincere ; where would be the propriety of God’s

requiring them to believe on his Son, with promises of eternal salvation, if they complied? And how would it be possible for them ever to blame themselves for not being saved in *this* way? But since this is not the case, since the word of God assures us that Christ “tasted death for every man,” whether he be elected or not, that “all things are now ready,” and that “whosoever will may come;” and consequently, that it is owing wholly to their own obstinate unbelief, and wilful rejection of the Saviour, that men perish in their sins, surely “every mouth will be stopped.”

3. Finally, who, in the view of this subject, can refrain from admiring the matchless wisdom, and ineffable grace of God, manifested in devising and executing the glorious plan of salvation by a Redeemer? To have devised a way, so that the character and government of God should remain unsullied, and yet the guilty violators of his law be pardoned, and this “freely by the grace of God,” was as much above the wisdom of man, as the heavens are higher than the earth. Yet such a plan hath God devised. In it “mercy and truth have met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.” This plan bears upon it the stamp of infinite wisdom. The all-wise God hath marked it for his own. No wonder “the angels desire to look into these things.” But what language can express, what tongue can speak the sentiments of those, for whom the Son of God hath not only shed his blood; but whom he hath also “redeemed from all iniquity, and purified unto himself for a peculiar people!” Will hosannas ever languish up-

on their tongues? Will not eternity itself be filled with the praises of the Redeemer? Well may the ransomed of the Lord come to the heavenly Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads, crying, with a loud voice, "salvation unto God, who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever." *Amen.*

N. B. To prevent a misapprehension of what is said on the doctrine of election, (in page 5th of the preface,) we would observe a distinction which must be made between God's eternal purpose, and the *manifestation* of his purpose. We believe, that not only every event, but the means by which every event is accomplished, were determined by the decree of God, in eternity. We do not conceive, however, that the sovereign mercy of God in election, is *displayed* in the atonement, as made for some, and not for others, but in God's regenerating some and not others, according to his eternal purpose.

The elect were doubtless chosen to salvation from eternity. This, however, presupposes their ruined state, and the purpose of God to provide an atonement through Christ, in whom they were chosen. This does not imply, that an atonement through Christ, and their eternal election in him, are the same thing. In view of mankind, *as already plunged in guilt and ruin*, and of Christ, *as making an adequate atonement*, it pleased God to choose a multitude to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and a belief of the truth. In their complete recovery and salvation, "the purpose of God, according to election," is carried into full and final effect. In all this, God acts as a most holy and wise sovereign, "according to the good pleasure of his will." "Therefore hath he mercy, on whom he will have mercy."

